

HIGHLY IMPORTANT PRO-SLAVERY MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTH.

From the Charleston Mercury, Nov. 9.

Pursuant to a call, a meeting of the citizens of Orangeburg district was held to-day, 6th Novem-ber, in the court-house, which was well filled on the occasion.

On motion of Capt. Jacob Stroman, Hon. S. Glove was called to the chair, and Drs. T. A. Elliott and J. W. Taylor appointed secretaries. The chairman then made some brief remarks, stating the object of the meeting.

Gen. D. F. Jamison then rose, and moved the appointment of a committee of twenty-five, to take into consideration the continued agitation by Congress of the question of slavery; whereupon the following committee was appointed:—Gen. D. F. Jamison, Capt. Jacob Stroman, Capt. Donald Rowe, Capt. P. S. Jennings, Major D. J. Rumph, Col. W. L. Lewis, Capt. Murray Robinson, Dr. W. S. Rave, J. B. McMichael, John H. Palmer, Dr. J. D. Rumph, Col. A. Ott, J. J. Wannamaker, Thos. Oliver, Capt. Lewis Felder, Major D. S. Dannelly, Oliver, C. M. Dantzer, Capt. D. Houser, J. J. Andrews, Dr. Benj. Lewis, Henry Ellis, L. E. Cooner, Dr. J. H. Morgan, Capt. L. E. D. Bowman, Capt. V. D. V. Jamison.

During the absence of the committee, Capt. T. B. Whitney addressed the meeting; after which the committee, through their chairman, Gen. Jamison, made the following report:

The committee appointed to take into consideration the continued agitation, by Congress, of the question of slavery, what checks can be interposed to prevent such attacks upon the character and institutions of the South, and if that cannot be prevented, to declare what stand they are now prepared to take on this most important subject, beg leave to submit the following report, and the accompanying resolutions:

The time has arrived when the slaveholding States of this confederacy must take decided action upon the continued attacks of the North against their domestic institutions, or submit in silence to that humiliating position in the opinion of mankind that longer acquiescence must inevitably reduce them. Forbearance is often a virtue with nations as with individuals; but when it involves the loss of position or character in either, it has, dishonorable submission. It will permit the constitution to be trampled under foot; it is willing to become a fixed minority, used only to assist in registering edicts for a jealously, hostile, and unjust majority, who admit no rule to govern by their own will, and no measure but the keenest conception of their own interest, it is best that it should be known to us at once, and that we should endeavor to meet the state of ourselves, as well as we may, to a state of things so degrading. That such will be the inevitable result of longer submission to the incessant attacks on our characters and institutions, your committee cannot for a moment doubt, unless the South shall take firm and concerted action to prevent it. The agitation of the subject of slavery commenced in the fanciful notions of a few scattered abolitionists, to whom it was a long time confined; but now it has swelled into a torrent of popular opinion at the North; it has invaded the fireside and the church, the press and the halls of legislation; it has seized upon the deliberations of Congress, and at this moment is sapping the foundations, and about to overthrow the political structure that the ingenuity of man has ever devised.

The overt efforts of abolitionism were confined for a long period to annoying applications to Congress, under color of the pretended right of petition; it has since directed the whole weight of its malign influence against the annexation of Texas, and had well nigh succeeded in the incorporation of that important province; but emboldened by success and the inaction of the South, in an unjust and selfish spirit of national agrarianism, it would now appropriate the whole public domain. It might well have been supposed that the undisturbed possession of the whole of Oregon territory would have satisfied the non-slaveholding States, but they now hold, by the incorporation of the ordinance of 1872 into the bill of the last session for establishing a territorial government for Oregon. That provision, however, was not sustained by them from any apprehension that the territory could ever be settled from the States of the South, but it was intended as a gratuitous insult to the Southern people, and a malignant and unjust attack upon the institution of slavery.

The boundary between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States was supposed to be fixed by a solemn compact on the part of the two sections, known as the Missouri Compromise, and the line of 36.30 north latitude, was adopted as the limit between them. Whatever may be the opinions of your Committee as to the propriety of the compact, and the concessions made by the South to preserve the Union, they would not be willing to see it disturbed, as it has been sanctioned by time and long acquiescence; but beyond that, they would not concede one inch, should it shatter this confederacy into thirty fragments. It is this further concession that we are now called upon to make, and no new line has been hinted at. We are called upon to give up the whole public domain to the financial cravings of abolitionism, and the unholy lust of political power. A territory, acquired by the whole country for the use of all, where treasure has been squandered like chaff, and Southern blood poured out like water, is sought to be appropriated by one section, because the other chooses to adhere to an inscription held not only under the guarantees that brought this confederacy into existence, but under the highest sanctions of Heaven. Should we quietly fold our hands under this assumption on the part of the non-slaveholding States, the fate of the South is sealed, the institution of slavery is gone, and its existence will be a question of time. Are the Southern people prepared to make such a base abandonment of their natural, social and political rights? Your committee hope not; they believe not. What, then, shall be the remedy? Your committee are unwilling to anticipate what will be the result of the combined wisdom and joint action of the Southern portion of the Confederacy on this question; but as an initiatory step to a concert of action on the part of the people of South Carolina, they respectfully recommend for the adoption of this meeting, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the continued agitation of the question of slavery, by the people of the non-slaveholding States, by their legislatures, and by their representatives in Congress, exhibits not only a want of national courtesy, but is a palpable violation of good faith towards the slaveholding States, who adopted the present Constitution "in order to form a more perfect Union."

Resolved, That while we acquiesce in adopting the boundary between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, known as the Missouri Compromise line, we will not submit to any further restriction upon the rights of any Southern man to carry his property and his institutions into territory acquired by Southern treasure and by Southern blood.

Resolved, That should the Wilcox proviso, or any other restriction, be applied by Congress to the territories of the United States, south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, we recommend to our representative in Congress, as the decided opinion of this portion of his district, to leave his seat in that body, and return home.

Resolved, That we respectfully suggest to both houses of the Legislature of South Carolina, to adopt a similar recommendation as to our Senators in Congress from this State.

Resolved, That upon the return home of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Legislature of South Carolina should be forthwith assembled, to adopt such measures as the exigency may demand.

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing report and resolutions be transmitted, by the chairman of this meeting, to our representatives in Congress, and that copies of the same be laid before both bodies of the Legislature of South Carolina.

After a few remarks by the chairman of the committee, the reported resolutions were seconded by Capt. V. D. V. Jamison, who was followed by Capt. O. M. Dantzer.

The resolutions were then submitted, read, and, together with the report, were unanimously adopted.

On motion of Capt. Jamison, it was ordered that copies of the proceedings of this meeting be sent to the Charleston Mercury, the Liberator, and the South Carolinian, with a request that they be published.

J. W. TAYLOR, Secretary.
T. A. ELLIOT, Secretary.

The Emancipator, once the property and official organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, (which was so foolishly wrested from the Society at the Secession of 1840,) is at last defunct, having yielded its life to the Boston Republican. The following notice of this event, from the Utica "Model Worker," (a paper unfriendly to the American Society,) is sufficiently caustic to save us the trouble of making any additional animadversions.

THE EMANCIPATOR.

The last number of the Emancipator and Free Soil Press, dated Nov. 8, 1848, and calling itself Vol. XIII. No. 29—Whole number 653, contains the following announcement:

NEW ARRANGEMENT. It gives us great pleasure to announce to our readers, that arrangements have been completed for the union of the Emancipator with the Republican. The proprietors of the Emancipator will be connected with the Republican, so that no fears need be entertained that the anti-slavery and moral tone of the paper will be in the least diminished. In other respects, our paper will be far superior to what it has ever been. We shall have an able and experienced editor in the person of Mr. Adams, son of John Quincy, and late Burn-er nominee for the Vice Presidency. Immediately after the Buffalo Convention of Aug. 9-10, Mr. Adams left the editorial chair of the paper, and its name was changed.

The Emancipator was established in New York City, in 1833, by Charles W. Denison, a Baptist divine, who has been since that time pretty much all things to all men, and is now, we believe, the editor of a native American daily in Boston. It has passed through various changes, having been edited by C. W. Denison, Joshua Leavitt, Eliza Wright, its present conductor, and mayhap some others. It has been a strong and reliable paper in its time, and once enjoyed the general confidence of the friends of freedom. But it had of late fallen very low. Our readers have lately seen some specimens of its degradation and unworthiness. Of all the apostate Liberty papers, we are inclined to think it took the lead in the path of infamy.

No fears need be entertained that the anti-slavery and moral tone of the paper will be in the least diminished. No, certainly not. We do not believe its moral tone could be diminished. A journal that will affirm that the Amistad negroes were indebted for their escape from Cuba gibes to Mr. Van Buren's humanity and sense of justice, in any degree, may well quote in another sense from that writer intimated, John Bunyan's line:

"He that is down need fear no fall."

We hope that the Republican will be an improvement on the Emancipator, albeit the "proprietors" of the Emancipator will be connected with the Republican; but we can wish no success to the combined papers on a platform that aims to "limit and localize" American Slavery, and proposes no interference with slavery within the limits of any State. On such a platform, they cannot support any candidate essentially better than Van Buren, though they can hardly find one whose history is stained with as shameless atrocity.

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, NOVEMBER 24, 1848.

THE BIBLE.

The Letters we are publishing from HENRY C. WRIGHT, respecting the Divine Authority of the Bible, in connection with War and Slavery, will probably alarm some and offend others who may chance to read them, especially in the ranks of 'orthodoxy'; but it cannot be denied that the subject is one of vast importance, and therefore worthy of searching investigation. The right of private judgment is the cardinal doctrine of Protestantism; and it is a doctrine fatal to every form of spiritual infallibility. It allows no man, no conclave of men, to determine arbitrarily, whether the Bible is of heaven or of men; how much of it is in accordance with the truth, or how much mixed with error; what portion of it is genuine, or what spurious; how this precept is to be understood, or that declaration interpreted. It leaves the human mind (as it should be left) free to judge of the origin, authenticity, inspiration, authority, value of the Bible, according to its own perception of right, its own conviction of duty.

The natural result is, a wide diversity of opinions respecting the book, and the duties it inculcates. Men equally sincere arrive at diametrically opposite views as to its teachings. Some find in it the doctrine of the Trinity, of total depravity, of the atonement, of eternal reprobation, in the Calvinistic sense. Others find no such doctrines. Some derive from it divine sanctions of polygamy, war, slavery, wine bibbing, capital punishment, the *lex talionis*, governments upheld by military and naval power, autocracy, monarchy, aristocracy. Others construe it in direct opposition to all such views. Some believe in its plenary, some in its partial inspiration; others reject the popular notion of inspiration, whether plenary or partial. Some reverence the volume as holy and divine, and with superstitious awe; others esteem it as of incomparable worth; while others treat it with contempt, and pronounce it a pernicious book. A multitude of rival sects find in its pages any quantity of proof-texts in support of their own peculiar faith, and each one makes out at least a plausible case for itself. In this Babel confusion of tongues, the questions arise—Who is right? what is truth? what is it to believe in the Bible?

We think that much of this confusion arises from the common error of regarding the Bible as a unit—a work prepared by one mind, (and that a divine one,) consecrated, for the guidance of all mankind; instead of realizing the fact, that it is a compilation of Jewish and Christian manuscripts, written in different parts of the world, in ages more or less remote from each other—written by nobody known by whom, beyond what supposition and probability may suggest. As to its real authority, no book is involved in more obscurity—not even the Letters of Junius. As it is not one production, but many productions—as it is neither exclusively Jewish nor wholly Christian, but a mixture of both—as it relates to different people, under different laws and usages, possessing various degrees of light and knowledge—it is easy to see why it is that, treating it as a unit, and every portion of it as alike sacred, so many jarring sentiments and so many conflicting practices are attempted to be justified from its pages. A dextrous theologian, having full liberty to range, in the name of God, from Genesis to Revelations, finds it an easy matter to cull out such passages as seem to substantiate the doctrine, or defend the practice, that he is zealous to maintain. It is true, he may be beaten with his own weapons, and yet neither the victor nor the vanquished be enlightened as to the truth.

The Bible, then, is the product of many minds, and was never designed to be a single volume, to be received as of infallible authority or divine origin. The Jewish portion of it is supposed to have been collected by Ezra. The Christian portion was decreed to be canonical by the Council of Nice.

There are two dogmas which the priesthood have attempted to enforce, respecting the Bible, from which has resulted great mischief. The first is—its plenary inspiration: in other words, that the writers of it were, in fact, only machines operated upon by a divine power, to communicate to the world in an infallible manner the contents of the book; so that it is free from all error. This is already rejected by many enlightened minds as a monstrous absurdity, and will be utterly exploded at last. The latest champion of the verbal inspiration of the Bible is Professor Gussen, whose work has been translated and published in this country. Don Quixote was both sane and discreet, when he mistook a wind-mill for a giant, in comparison with this biblical knight-errant. What miraculous endowment was needed to record the fact, that unto Job were born seven sons and three daughters; or that Paul left his cloak at Troas; or that he was shipwrecked at Malta; or that Solomon had six hundred wives and concubines; or that Samson caught three hundred foxes, and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails? And so of a thousand other occurrences.

The other dogma is—it is the only rule of faith and practice; so that whatever the Bible teaches or allows must be right, and whatever it forbids must be wrong, independent of all other considerations. This, there is no right principle or action, in itself; and but for the evidence, there would be no test of morality—no evidence of piety. Hence, if slavery, or war, is allowed in the book, it cannot be wrong; if a certain number of texts can be found to sanction a particular crime, then the crime is no longer such, but a virtuous act, because God has sanctioned it! What controversies have been held over the book, as to whether it is in favor of this or that form of government—whether it advocates human liberty, or permits human enslavement—whether it is opposed to all war, or only to wars of aggression—whether it maintains the inviolability of human life, or requires the execution of the murderer—whether it approves of the moderate use of intoxicating liquor, or enjoins the duty of total abstinence! As if monarchy, republicanism, slavery, war, the gallows, and alcoholic drink, could not be settled on their own merits, without an appeal to any book! As if God himself could make a lie the truth, wrong right, cruelty mercy, or poison an innocent beverage! Can they who appeal to the Bible, as to an infallible authority, for the rectitude of their conduct, have any belief in absolute justice?

No marvel that one extreme has been followed by another—that the doctrine of the divinity of the Bible has led to its contemptuous rejection as a base imposture. No marvel that while some are for exalting it as high as the throne of God, others (like our Boston correspondent Seward Mitchell) are for having it trampled under foot—the former, on the ground of its heavenly origin; the latter, on the supposition that it gives to despotism its power, and to priestcraft its opportunity. Both parties, we think, are greatly in error.

The Bible does not change, but the interpretations of the Bible are constantly fluctuating. Those interpretations are generally in accordance with popular opinion and the spirit of the interpreters. Men who are warlike—men who deem it no sin to enslave their fellow-men—men who are fond of retaliating injuries done to them—men who are fond of a ceremonial religion—naturally interpret the Bible in accordance with their views; while men of an opposite spirit construe its language in favor of perfect goodness and universal love. Even if we admit the plenary inspiration of the volume, nothing is gained by the admission; for, after all, it remains an open question, what does this inspired book teach?—and, in answering the question, those who most devoutly believe in its inspiration disagree as widely, even on practical morality, as do those who reject the doctrine.

Mr. Mitchell, in his sweeping condemnation of the book, says—"The Bible is like a fiddle; you can play any tune on it you please." Then, if the Bible is discordant to the ear of humanity, the fault must be in the player, rather than in the instrument. Shall the instrument therefore be broken in pieces? Let those pervert it to vile uses, who are so inclined; on them rest the responsibility. We believe it can be made to discourse most excellent music, and therefore set a high value upon it.

We have lost our traditional and educational notions of the holiness of the Bible, but we have gained greatly, we think, in our estimation of it. As a divine book, we never could understand it; as a human composition, we can fathom it to the bottom. Whoever receives it as his master, will necessarily be in bondage to it; but he who makes it his servant, under the guidance of truth, will find it truly serviceable. It must be examined, criticized, accepted or rejected, like any other book, without fear and without favor. Whatever excellence there is in it will be fire-proof; and if any portion of it be antiquated or worthless, let that portion be treated accordingly.

Mr. Mitchell is confident that the Bible "does sanction slavery"; but we are as confident that it does not, either under the Jewish or the Christian dispensation. If it did, we should agree with him that it is a curse to our race. As to war, it is as clearly condemned in the New Testament—and so of the gallows. To say, "If you wish to keep the slave in his chains, send him the Bible as soon as possible," is to deal in extravagant language. No people, possessed of the Bible, have ever been enslaved, though some have been enslavers. The Southern slaveholders are ashamed men; and if they believed what Mr. Mitchell asserts, instead of prohibiting, they would be prompt in circulating the Bible among their slaves.

We are fully aware how grievously the priesthood have perverted the Bible, and wielded it both as an instrument of spiritual despotism and in opposition to the sacred cause of humanity; still, it embodies an amount of excellence so great as to constitute it THE BOOK OF BOOKS.

Why should any wonder that some minds, keenly sensitive to the slightest outrage to humanity, and receiving the pulpit interpretations of the book as sound, grow morbidly averse to the Bible? Read the article on our last page, entitled "A Soldier of the Cross and of the Sword," which follows the communication of Mr. Mitchell! Think of identifying the Cross of Jesus, the Prince of Peace, with the Sword of the blood-stained Warrior, who, though an Orthodox clergyman, could make wading of Watts's Psalms and Hymns, and seize an opponent by his whiskers with one hand, while he "pommelled him soundly with the other"—and then in his pulpits attempt to justify the act from this text—"And I contended with them, and cured them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God!" [Nehemiah xiii. 23.] From this very applicable passage; says his eulogist, and the writer of his memoir, (the Rev. Dr. Murray of Elizabethtown, N. J.) he preached "a serious exhortatory discourse, placing himself right before his people, and silencing all opposition to his proceedings!" He was one day preaching to the battens—the next, marching with them to battle!! A Soldier of the Cross!

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

This organ of Unitarianism in the United States has never been second to any other Quarterly magazine, on the score of literary ability or religious catholicity. The number for November contains several articles of interest, though none pertaining to any of the reformatory movements of the age. Indeed, in such movements the Examiner has taken very little interest at any time; and this has been its defect. For a year or two past, however, it has shown less reluctance to the discussion of the great question of slavery, war, &c., than formerly. We remember when no abolitionist was allowed to be heard through that medium. The change which has taken place in public sentiment, on the subject of slavery, has neither been unheeded nor unfeeling by the Examiner; but it is still in an injurious sense a conservative periodical, and conducted by conservative hands. It will never venture, we fear, boldly to conflict with popular sins which have their J-gal sanctions, their religious bulwarks, and their multitudinous supporters. Though its title implies that it will subject usages and institutions, however time-honored or admired, to the test of a pure Christianity, yet it has been careful not to "examine" too familiarly those customs and practices which will not bear investigation, and which the public mind is not yet ready to condemn.

The articles in the last number are

- I. CONFUCIUS. This is an eloquent paper, relating to one of the most extraordinary men the world has ever known among its guides, oracles, redeemers. In the gentleness of his spirit, and the depth and purity of his moral philosophy, he appears to have no superior but Jesus of Nazareth; and in many things the two exhibit a wonderful identity of soul and sentiment. For example—five hundred years before Jesus, Confucius gave "the golden rule" of the former in two forms, the negative and the positive. Thus—"Do not to any one that which you do not wish should be done to you." Again—"Do unto another as thou wouldst be dealt with thyself." Thou needest this law alone; it is the foundation and principle of all the rest! How truly and comprehensively he defines love!—"The love of the perfect man is an universal love, whose object is all mankind." How old is the doctrine of human brotherhood! Yet where is the nation or tribe that has ever reduced this doctrine to practice? Our race is still in an anarchical state. Christendom is full of hostile banners. In the name of Christ is the star-spangled banner of America unfurled to the breeze. That name is the flag of England run up to the mast-head. And so of France, Spain, every nation in Europe. Of persecution, Confucius forcibly says—"He who persecutes a good man, makes war against Heaven. The good man is one with Tien (the Supreme Being); if you persecute the former, you take up arms against the latter." This is in agreement with the declaration of John—"God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." The reviewer concludes his essay as follows:—"From all we know of Confucius, we love and revere him. We admire his attachment to moral ideas. His life teaches the moral wealth of human nature, not less in our own age than in the remote period to which his name belongs." It is remarkable how utterly devoid he was of all pretence: "He never spoke as a prophet. He taught no new religion, claimed no Divine inspiration, and stood never on the ground of a supernatural mission. His moral genius qualified him to grasp universal principles flowing through the nature of man, and existent in the condition of things. To these he appealed. Through the law which Heaven has engraved on all hearts, he sought to reform his age and people." What higher law can be appealed to? It is delightful to celebrate such rationality.

- II. History of Harvard College.
- III. Catholicism and Protestantism in France.
- IV. The Use of the Word "Deus" in Plutus and Terence.

- V. Sacred Music.
- VI. French Literature and the French Pulpit.
- VII. Sphere of Human Influence.
- VIII. The Relation of the Pulpit to Future Ages.

- IX. Defence of Preaching.

- X. The Religion of Life: A Reverie.

Notices of Recent Publications.

The eighth article is from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Gannett of Boston, and is the Discourse which was delivered by him before the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, June 1, 1848. It is to be expected that a clergyman will defend his calling, and exhort the pulpit as the hope of the world; but, as he is an interested witness, his opinions are not to be received implicitly. When, therefore, he says that "the day has not passed by for the pulpit," it does by no means follow that such a day will not ultimately come, and the clerical profession, as a divine office, be abandoned. We believe that the day is not far distant; and if we live to behold it, we shall greatly rejoice. We do not object to such preachers as Paul, and Peter, and others of the apostolic school, who were the "fanatics" and "disorganizers" of their times; who bargained with no body of men when, where, how, or for what pecuniary inducement, they should utter their testimonies against sin and sinners; who never consulted a corrupt public sentiment, in order to avoid persecution; who had no salary to lose or to be diminished by a plain utterance of the truth; who never claimed to be above or distinct from the laity in the congregation of believers, but every one prayed or prophesied in order, all standing on the same platform of equality. But the modern clergy are not their successors, and may urge no apostolic claim to private veneration or popular respect. Dr. Gannett extracts all the "divinity" from them, in putting them in the same category with lawyers and physicians. He says, with an air of satisfaction that is almost ludicrous—"There are as many poor lawyers and poor physicians as there are poor preachers." Possibly; but of what benefit are they, as classes, to mankind? We expect that only a few will be eminent in their several employments. The ministry need not profess a comparison, in this respect, with other professions. Indeed! But the "other professions" claim to be human, not divine. The clergyman talks of being the "agent of God," an ambassador of Christ, of being filled with the Spirit, and delivering what he has had communicated to him from above;—but neither the lawyer nor physician lays claim to any thing beyond what he himself can originate and perform. Hence, on the ground of special inspiration, the clergy ought to throw into the shade all other professions. To say that "there are more merchants who fail in their business, than there are ministers who fail in their sermons," is a queer defence—a very secular one, at least, for a heavenly calling! But the defence ends not here. "Many of our preachers are obliged to prepare at least one sermon a week, and some of them two, or even more, the year through. Now I ask the man whose supineness is ever beating the pulpit, if he would lay the same requisition on the public orator or legal advocate? . . . No, he would be ashamed to make such a demand of any one but a minister. Why, then, in the name of justice, should he make it of the minister, who is but a man, at best, and not often made of finer mould than other men?" What does the reader think of this? The minister is no more divinely assisted than the lawyer or the physician, and therefore to be measured by the same standard. Remember that it is a "doctor of divinity" who voluntarily takes the witness's stand. But the witness has a very short memory; for he proceeds to affirm that "preaching is the highest exercise of the human powers. . . . Enter the pulpit as if it were the loftiest position you could take on earth. . . . If you would choose the

most honorable service, if you would exercise the highest function within the reach of man, if you desire to place yourself in the most enviable position on earth, [what self-conceit!] enter the ministry." And so it becomes a divine calling again, and is no longer secular, like that of the lawyer or physician. Now this shuffling from one standard to another cannot be allowed. If the clergy are to be judged simply as men, let them claim nothing of divinity; if they are superhuman, heaven-inspired, demigods, we shall insist on trying them by a superhuman test.

As to the loftiness of the pulpit, though the old fashioned mode of erecting it was somewhat elevated, the weathercock on the spire finds a more lofty position than the pulpit occupant, but both indicate which way the wind blows.

The preacher—we are told in this Discourse—"must apply Christianity to the habits and practices of the age in which he lives, even as the gauger applies his rule to the vessel he would measure, or the assayer his test to the metal he would prove. Very good; but where is the clergyman, in regular standing, who dares to be thus faithful? And where one Abiel is found, are there not scores of the fraternity, who, to avoid difficulty, refuse to say anything about 'the habits and practices of the age'?"

Dr. Gannett thinks otherwise. He says "it is an old slander, that the clergy always oppose social advancement, and it is a slander which every popular movement since the Reformation has refuted!" To this general assertion, we enter a general denial, and wait for the proof. But with amazing assurance he tells us—"Look at the relation they sustain to the reforms of the day, moral, political, or social; always ready to examine their claims, (!) sometimes compelled to pronounce the schemes of ardent philanthropists unwise and dangerous, but more often prompt to give their assistance, (!) and not seldom found among the foremost and firmest friends of the enterprise!" Verily, this is to make the wildest assertions—as far removed from the facts in the case as the North is from the South pole. Take the question of slavery, for example. The reducing of three millions of the inhabitants of this country to the awful condition of chattels, is an act of prodigious, impiety and cruelty so monstrous, that the clergy should have needed no solicitation to induce them to cry out against it in thunder tones. Yet to this hour, as a class, their sympathy and cooperation are notoriously with the slaveholders, with whom they are in religious fellowship; they seek to cover the unflattering abolitionists with shame and infamy; and their meeting-houses are closed against those who wish to inculcate the doctrine, that slaveholding is, under all circumstances, a sin against God. Indeed, the history of the anti-slavery movement will prove the struggle for the overthrow of slavery to have been with the clergy of the land, rather than with the actual holders of slaves at the South. The facts are on record, and can never be effaced. We admit that there have been, and that there are, exceptions to the general rule—clergy-men who have done, and are doing, much toward liberating those who are in bondage; but these only serve to confirm the rule—and of this select number, Dr. Gannett is not one. The manner in which they have been treated by their clerical brethren generally, of the same denomination, and by the churches, has been contemptuous and most unchristian. Will this unworthy successor of William Ellery Channing pretend that he, or the Unitarian clergy, countenanced Dr. Channing in his efforts to awaken pity for the slave, and remorse for the existence of slavery? When and where has he given a single word of encouragement to those who have borne the heat and burden of the day in the cause of the oppressed? When and where has he declined appearing as the advocate of that notorious conspiracy against "liberty, equality, fraternity," the American Colonization Society? When has he allowed an abolitionist to occupy his pulpit? What Unitarian clerical minister from the South would he exclude from it? How was the lamented Follen treated in his day? How has John Pierpont been treated? What approbation has Theodore Parker received from the clergy for his faithful anti-slavery testimonies—his apostolic boldness in grappling with popular sins? For how many years did not Samuel J. May stand up among the Unitarian clergy alone, in his earnest and Christ-like advocacy of the cause of negro emancipation—being deemed an intolerable trouble-maker of Israel? You—Ezra S. Gannett—ought to be among the last of the "cloth" to come forward, and claim for the clergy the credit of sustaining a friendly relation to the reforms of the day, moral, political, or social. Your course has been most perverse, your counsel most injurious, your opposition to the uncompromising friends of reform most bitter. You have yet to repent, and to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, for the great evil you have done.

We appeal to those who are struggling to carry forward the reforms of the day, as to their experience and knowledge of clerical influence. Friends of peace—of moral reform—of non-resistance—of the abolition of the gallows—of woman's rights—of land reform—of social reorganization—&c. &c., are you not ready to testify that you find the clergy hindrances rather than helps? We believe that the response will be in the affirmative, in every case.

A FREE PRESS. Some persons have very queer notions of what constitutes a free press. Unless every communication of theirs is published, no matter for how many good reasons it may be omitted, forthwith they begin to "sigh for a free and impartial press!" Our Cape Cod friend Ekanah Nickerson appears to be one of this class. Now, while we shall endeavor to see that justice is done to all parties in our columns, we do not feel under obligation to lay before our readers every thing that may be sent to us for publication. As to E. N.'s letter of the 28th August, we presume it was unintentionally delayed, until his second came to hand, and the publication of that was deemed by Mr. Quincy as an equivalent for the other. Friend Nickerson appears to have a very good estimate of his own piety, and is quite confident that P. P. is a sinner. All this is quite complacent, but it proves nothing. We are equally grieved and surprised at his course, which appears to us very reprehensible, inasmuch as its tendency must be to encourage mobocracy on the Cape, and to gratify the feelings of the Harwich rioters. There is one sentence in his communication which is unintelligible, but we know not how to mend it. It is this:—"Last year, when he [Parker Pillsbury] was here, he stated, in answer to one who said that anti-slavery did not cover the whole ground, there was something?" What did he state?

OF Another Letter from a Clergyman on "Cape Cod," in reply to our animadversions, has been received. It can be found in our next week, we shall do so. It is quite verbose, but we shall spend it in a tea-pot; and then we hope this "tempest in a tea-pot" will cease to rage. The Rev. Edward Morris is evidently ambitious of displaying himself; but, whether he is actuated by vanity or malice, or both, we will not prolong the controversy for his special gratification. He has written enough to understand that his sneers and thrusts at the "Come-outers" and "Disunionists" will in all probability bring grist to his mill, enter to a depraved public sentiment, gratify the mobocratic spirit of the Cape, and win from "the brotherhood of thieves" an approving smile. A most assiduous and intrepid ass!

OF A letter from Henry Grew, of Philadelphia, in reply to Henry C. Wright, respecting the Bible, was received too late for insertion this week.

The letter of Fitch Winchester, on the same subject, shall appear next week.

RECENT ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTIONS AND OTHER MEETINGS.

DEAR MR. GANNETT:

Notwithstanding the heat and rage of politics, which have pervaded the land during the past two months, our Anti-Slavery Conventions have been, with very few exceptions, deeply interesting and numerous. Of some of them, occasional notice has been taken in the columns of the Liberator, but of others none at all, although I hoped for a notice of some of them from those who acted as Secretaries. In the absence of such, I have thought it my duty to make a brief record myself of the progress of the Conventions.

About fifty Conventions of the whole number (one hundred) have thus far been held. A portion of these were held beyond the limits of the State, and probably others will be. In this course we have felt justified by the fact, that, although acting as Agents of the Massachusetts Society, the work of conducting these Conventions was committed to this Society by the New England Anti Slavery Convention, held in May last. Four Conventions have, accordingly, been held in New Hampshire, three in Maine, and one in Connecticut. Some accounts of the meetings at Bangor, Portland and Bath have already appeared in the Liberator. The meetings in New Hampshire were less encouraging, if we except that at Portsmouth, which was thought to be a good and impressive meeting.

Returning again to Massachusetts—Conventions have been held in several towns in Plymouth, Norfolk, Bristol, and Worcester counties. Time and space will not permit me to speak of them separately, even had I been present at them all. The Convention at Hingham was not as heartily sustained, by all those who have long borne the name of abolitionists, as was to have been expected; but it was a large and effective meeting. The Convention at Amherst was such an one, in numbers, spirit, and good works, as we never fail to have in that earnest anti-slavery town.

The New Bedford Convention, though held during the most active preparations for the Presidential election, was very fully attended, and the deepest interest was manifested throughout. The merits of the Free Soil movement were subjected to a thorough discussion, (as indeed has been the case in most of the recent Conventions,) in which its friends and supporters took a large part. The large Hall in which we met on Sunday (Liberty Hall) was filled the greater part of the time to its utmost capacity.

While at New Bedford, we learned that ELIZOTT CRESSON, the Quaker advocate of the banishment of the colored people, (*alias*, of colonization), had recently lectured there on African Missions. His lecture was given in the Baptist church, and many of his positions and assertions were of a nature to call forth inquiry from the audience. In evident fear that some troublesome abolitionist would propound unwelcome questions, the Rev. Dr. Babcock, pastor of the church, allowed no interval of time to elapse between friend Cresson's closing remarks and his own concluding devotions. He sprang a prayer upon the audience in a very artist-like manner, to which, having hands lifted, the hearers were suffered to depart to their homes. Friend Cresson also attended a political gathering in New Bedford, and advocated the election of Zachary Taylor to the Presidency! How wonderfully in keeping with the Quaker testimonies as to Slavery and War!

Very encouraging Conventions were subsequently held in Taunton and Quincy; since which, the scene of our labors has been mainly in Worcester County.

It was just on the eve of the Presidential election that we held the Convention at FLYNTONVILLE, a flourishing village in Marlboro', adjoining Bolton. Though the weather was unpropitious, it was a well-attended meeting, and the results, we doubt not, will be advantageous to the cause of truth and freedom—freedom both of the slaves and ourselves. The anti-slavery cause has some staunch and unwavering friends in this town.

The next Convention was at Leominster, a town where much anti-slavery work has been done. Though some of our friends there lamented deeply the fact, that many open and decided Democrats had yielded to the temptation to vote once more under the bloody and despotic Constitution which binds the Union together, yet we found very much to cheer us in Leominster—strong assurance that the soundest minds and truest hearts in the "Heart of the Commonwealth" are engaged with the question of slavery, and will never surrender, until this land shall cease to legalize the traffic in men, women and children—cease to sanction and protect the "sum of all villainies." Never were sterner rebukes uttered against a tyrannical State and a corrupt Church than our friend Foster uttered in Leominster. Never were such rebukes heard and received with more candor and fairness than were these by the large audience which met us through the day and evening in that town. Such a spirit, which is resolved to hear and weigh all the evidence in the case, cannot fail of arriving at the truth.

But these remarks are extending too far, and I will only add (in this connection) that lectures, independent of the conventions, have been steadily kept up by our faithful agents, Mr. Pillsbury and Miss Stone.

I must not omit a brief allusion to two anti-slavery festivals, which it has recently been my good fortune to attend;—I mean the anti-slavery parties at Weymouth and Upton. For many years, the anti-slavery women of these towns

